

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

3 1761 00689673 2

THE ANGLO-FRENCH NATION

A STUDY IN
INTERPENETRATION

By
JEAN FINOT



DA
47
.1
F5
1916
c.1
ROBA



17. 12. 1854

THE ANGLO-FRENCH NATION

Authorised Translation from the French.

THE ANGLO-FRENCH NATION

A STUDY IN INTERPENETRATION

BY

JEAN FINOT

145289.
15/12/18.

LONDON

CONSTABLE AND COMPANY LTD

1916



CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY NOTE	vii
THE ANGLO-FRENCH NATION	I
Disappearance of false race theories.	
WHAT ENGLAND OWES TO FRANCE	3
Common origin of the two peoples ; benefits to England of the " French Conquest," cultural, political ; French influence on English language and literature ; English individualism the result of the Norman invasion ; evolution of the English genius—Chaucer, Shakespeare and Montaigne, Sir Thomas Browne, Donne, Dryden, Bacon, Hobbes and Bayle, George Eliot and Rousseau ; English admirers of France—Wordsworth, Buckle.	
WHAT FRANCE OWES TO ENGLAND	28
Formation of the French genius ; French ignorance of England ; contrast between French and English religious wars ; Rapin de Thoiras' " History of the English Parliament " ; influence of English parliamentary institutions on France ; French admirers of England—the Abbé Prévost, Rousseau ; England and the Great Revolution ; English influence on Danton, Lafayette, Mirabeau ; English influence on French writers—Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau ; Germany's debt to France and England ; parallel development of the two nations.	
ANGLO-FRENCH SOLIDARITY AT THE PRESENT DAY .	50
Great Britain as France's best colony ; economic relations equally advantageous to both countries ; Germany's unfair trade methods and insatiable	

appetite ; how Germany must be made to pay for the war ; England and France the principal securities for the future well-being of the world ; the Channel Tunnel as a symbol of their solidarity ; even war not able to destroy Anglo-French friendly relations ; the alliance of France and England a latent fact throughout history ; the present brotherhood of arms ; English heroism ; the union of France and England the necessary basis for the United States of Europe ; Conclusion.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE Anglo-French Entente, before it was finally brought about, seemed almost impossible of realisation. Every effort was met by the insuperable obstacle of misunderstandings, centuries old, which were constantly being sharpened and renewed by a lack of comprehension on the part of both peoples. But an admirable rally and display of goodwill on both sides of the Channel soon overcame the hatred which was alleged to exist between the two races. I had the honour of opening this campaign in the French press, at the very moment when our Quai d'Orsay seemed frankly hostile to it. My first articles were received with hundreds of protests from all sides. They constituted, it was considered, an attack on national aspirations and national interests which tended, so everyone believed, in a contrary direction to those of Great Britain.

But in the end our efforts were supported by several great English and French newspapers. As by enchantment, long-standing recriminations and misunderstandings vanished in the space of a few years. The idea of the Entente was taken up by eminent men in both countries; they were supported by King Edward, to whom France and

England paid the same homage of unforgetting gratitude, and very soon their endeavours were crowned with brilliant success.

Life is often an experimenting school for ideas. It renders their testing easier, and gives a final approval to deductions which are often at first purely speculative, but which, thanks to its support, are elevated into the rank of truths.

The conception of an Anglo-French nation, which I was bold enough to call up in 1900, then seemed too uncertain of attainment. To-day it answers to a great reality.

THE ANGLO-FRENCH NATION

OUR scientific terminology is as full of bias as the soul of a devotee. The theory of race, from which all our political or anthropological speculations set forth, is dying in silence; and that hatred between nations, which is based on the alleged contradiction between their origins or an inaccurate analysis of their blood, is vanishing as well. It was once thought, for example, that the French, considered as a Latin race, were destined to hate the English, viewed as a branch of the Germanic family. But Latin blood counts for next to nothing¹ in the composition of the French nation; the formation of the English nation, however, its blood, its collective soul, its civilisation, as well as its interests, link it indissolubly to the French root. If Anglo-French history be studied impartially, it will be seen that the two peoples, though separated by

¹ As is proved by Jullien in his "Gallia," there is, in Western countries, none so free of Roman blood as Gaul. The number of Roman colonists settled in the valley of the Albe, the Rhone, and the Moselle never exceeded 30,000.

mutual ignorance, are merely two branches of the same tree, issuing from one and the same trunk.

The wonderful spectacle of their historical development is a weighty testimony to the beneficent influence which the two nations have constantly exerted on each other's destiny, their common sources of civilisation, as well as the resemblance between the battles which each has waged for the triumph of similar principles of life. They have often quarrelled, but, without knowing it, they have rendered one another unceasing service. Their whole history proves the existence of a mysterious element which, hovering over the obstacles set up by passing events of the day, has always brought them into subjection to a pre-existent force of moral and intellectual solidarity. The French and English, thanks to this mutual influence, have arrived at a consciousness of their political personality, have won their liberties, and have formed their national genius.

We are far from desiring to describe exhaustively the extent of their debts to one another. To do this would require as many volumes of comparative literature and history as our work numbers pages. We shall rather confine ourselves to giving a bird's-eye view and to indicating certain striking incidents which the two nations have experienced in common, with the object of showing the foundations of their unconscious brotherhood throughout the ages.

Nature has chosen them and brought them

together in order to unite them in a perfect marriage. In spite of passing quarrels, they have been happy in the beneficent and salutary assistance which each has given the other. As a safeguard to their pride, it has been the duty now of France, now of England, to take up the part of saviour, protector, or benefactor of the other. Tear out from the history of France the pages written under the influence of England, and France would be strangely diminished ; attempt in thought to shut out France from the history of English civilisation, and all the greatness of the Anglo-Saxons would disappear in mist.

I.

WHAT ENGLAND OWES TO FRANCE.

(a) The Origin of the Two Peoples.

Ever since the time of their political origins history decreed that they should remain united. In spite of the sea which separated ancient Gaul from ancient Britain, it was the same people which from time immemorial was to be found in each country. The identical character of the monuments constructed on both sides of the Channel (Stonehenge in England and the alignments of Carnac, in Gaul) is a proof that, even before the Celts native inhabitants, similar in aspiration and mentality, lived on the soil of each country.

When the Celts came upon the scene of history

they too dominated both sides of the sea. Even the name of Great Britain is due to its Celtic inhabitants, the Britons. Later, the Celts, living on both sides of the Channel, were at one and the same time brought into subjection by the Romans. The resemblance between the peoples occupying the two sides of the Channel caused Tacitus, when speaking of the Celts in England, to say: "Proximi Gallis et similes sunt" ("They are nearest the Gauls, and resemble them"). In spite of marks left by various peoples who came now from this part and now from the other and settled on the edge of the Channel, the traces of Celtic influence on the two countries were to be always powerful and enduring.

When later the Germanic peoples were at war with their neighbours, they benefited with their kindness and afflicted with their savagery Great Britain and France alike. The Teutons, chiefly represented by the Angles and the Saxons, were to take possession of the former, while the *other Teutons*, known as the Franks, were to establish themselves in Gaul. The difference between the two cases consists, not in the quality, but in the quantity, of the aggressors. The Franks, being less numerous, amalgamated with the Celts of Gaul, whose civilisation then followed its normal development. The Angles and Saxons, on the other hand, were to form a superimposed stratum and retain their own culture, songs, and language. When the gulf separating conquerors and conquered threatened to become

deeper and deeper the invasion of the French under William the Conqueror, the most important fact in English history, was to intervene and save Great Britain from all those evils into which she might have fallen, and endow her with national consciousness as well as political cohesion and unity. This is the source from which she will draw all that splendid culture which in the future will make her one of the leading nations of the world. It might be said that a kind Providence, watching over her elective affinity, sent Great Britain a new body of Frenchmen and a generous portion of their ideas in order to bring about the miracle of a *rapprochement* which was then so gravely imperilled. Let us briefly recall this series of events.

After the death of Edward the Confessor England, caught between two fires, nearly became the prey of the Teutons of the North (the Scandinavians), whose chief, Harold Hardrada, proposed to re-establish the empire of Canute. He was defeated and forced to withdraw. Then came the turn of William, Duke of Normandy, who asserted his claim to the crown of England. At the head of Bretons, Picards, and Normans, he came to Great Britain, and succeeded so well where the Teutons had failed (battle of Hastings, 1067), that the conquered land, throughout succeeding centuries, did not merely live under the domination of the French, but was also nourished and permeated by French ideas. This influence was to prove indestructible. In vain for the two

countries to detest and hate each other and carry on wars of mutual extermination; both were henceforth to bear ineffaceable traces of having lived, suffered, and thought in common. The French conquerors brought with them their rich and attractive literature. Its joyous and serene echoes were to be heard throughout Great Britain. The Celtic bards, who had been reduced to silence by the sad and languishing muse of the Anglo-Saxons, were now to be awakened from their sleep and take fresh courage. The broken link with the past was now to be joined once more; and the Celts, outstripping the Angles and Saxons, were to be reborn under the influence of a culture which was so precious to them. In the wake of the conquerors, other Frenchmen disembarked on the island. Incomparable organisers, they swiftly cured the evils which so many fratricidal wars had brought upon the country. Later, they effected a union between the divided populations; they were to endow the country with political centralisation and bring its national consciousness to birth. The Saxons, as we learn from the old Latin chronicler William of Malmesbury, were accustomed to drink to their heart's desire and spend their substance in feasting day and night, while at the same time they were content with wretched dwellings; the French and the Romans, on the contrary, were delicate in their food and careful in dress, even to finickiness. The English people, under French influence and as a result of the French living among them, became

aware of their civilising mission, their greatness, and their first ideas of national self-consciousness. Alert and active in the face of necessity, the French produced a complete revolution. About thirty years after their arrival the Gothic style and the Roman, which preceded it and provided a foundation for its solidity, were born. Before the death of King John the French had succeeded in founding more than 550 schools. In order to appreciate at its true value the political tact of William and his followers, let us recall with what delicacy and profundity of thought, rare for that time, they appoint for worship in the Calendar, and on the same equal footing, both Celtic and Anglo-Saxon saints. Finally, in their anxiety to bring together the Anglo-Saxons, with their Odin, and the Celts, who proudly put their origins back among the ruins of Troy, they accept both glorious ancestors. Yes, they say, the country owes its illustrious origin to Odin, but then the illustrious Odin was descended from Brutus of Troy !

Thus concord reigns where for centuries there had been nothing but quarrels and mortal hatred.

To illustrate the merits of France and the greatness of her services, we may compare the condition of England before and after the battle of Hastings. In the 10th century English soil was continually subject to a succession of invasions. The Danes, the Celts, the Saxons—in short, all the conquerors of the North—never ceased to make it their meeting-

place. The original Saxon inhabitants were forced to flee to the forests and to live there like outlaws in order to escape the cruelty of their foreign masters. For a continuous period of fifty years the Danes reigned as sovereigns with unlimited power.

When the good Saxon king, Edward the Confessor, finally succeeded in winning back the throne of his ancestors, he found himself at the mercy of the Saxon barons, who, in their savage perversity, were committing innumerable and unnamable crimes under his very eyes. The King had been brought up in Normandy, and in consequence his feelings were more delicate ; he was grieved by this state of affairs, but he saw no alternative before him but of acquiescing in it. According to a contemporary chronicler, the Anglo-Saxons at this time were absolutely without culture. It was very rare to meet with a man who could read or write. " They consume all their substance at table in little miserable houses ; their arms are laden with golden bracelets ; their skin is covered with paintings and coloured tattooings ; their gluttony makes them pot-bellied ; their passion for liquor turns them to brutes."

In his remarks on the conquerors the Saxon writer is lost in praise of their kindness ; they give as much honour to foreigners as to their fellow-countrymen, he says, and they do not disdain to enter into marriage with their Saxon subjects (" *De gestis regum anglorum*," I. iii.).

The Saxons themselves would have had no objection to seeing the throne pass to Prince William of Normandy. But Harold, one of King Edward's barons, succeeded in getting himself nominated heir to the throne. William appealed to the Pope, who gave his decision in favour of the Norman prince. This favourable judgment was conveyed to him together with a horse of St. Peter and a blessed standard.

Thus William's invasion took on the character of a holy crusade. Was he not appointed to bring about the triumph of Rome's judgment? We emphasise this point, for Frenchmen rallied from all parts of the country in defence of the sacred cause. According to the historians, the Normans were in a minority ; they were doubtful as to the issue of the battle, and so preferred to abstain from taking part. There was, however, an enormous number of Bretons who had invaded Normandy with their Prince Conan with the object of fighting against William, but joined him after the disastrous end of their chief.

When the Conquest had been brought to a successful conclusion William showed himself the most excellent of princes. A few years later an organisation, as solidly built as that of Charlemagne, took the place of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy. A strong kingdom and one held in high esteem was thus brought into being, supported by a well-disciplined Church. William's prestige reached such a height that, according to an Anglo-Saxon chronicler, he

would have conquered Ireland by the fame of his courage alone and without any recourse to arms had Heaven but granted him two more years of life. He established justice and laid the first foundations of a regular army. A large number of castles were built throughout the land ; private property was declared to be inviolable, and domestic peace reigned where formerly there had been nothing but bloodshed and disorder.

It is true that the Conquest, like every display of brute force, gave rise to a good many disasters and misfortunes in Anglo-Saxon territories. The good is never absolute, and its triumph often necessitates painful sacrifices. Yet to understand the decisive importance and beneficial influence of William's invasion on the formation of the Anglo-Saxon genius and the Anglo-Saxon race it is enough to review its results.

French civilisation, coming from across the Channel, now finally established itself in England. It manifested itself under different forms—songs, historical chronicles, romances of chivalry. The conquerors had no desire to wound national susceptibilities. Their consciousness of a common origin, it is true, inclined them, above all, to the Britons (Celts), whom they assisted in reviving the love poems of Tristan and Iseult, the adventures of Morgan le Fay, of Lancelot and Guinevere, or of Perceval, divine legends by which the literature and music of our own days were to be renewed.

But at the same time they did not forget the meagre Anglo-Saxon heritage, and they adopted its legends of Horn and Havelock and the poem of Beowulf.

(b) *English Language and Literature under French Influence.*

French language and thought thus struck root in England. French became the principal language not only of the Government and the ruling classes, but also of all those with any claim to be superior to the common people. And the latter, wishing to be like the great lords, began to speak French. The Anglo-Saxon tongue yields to the new order of things and disappears. Why should it struggle, since people not only avoided speaking it, but were almost ashamed to write it? By the side of the new stock of Englishmen of French origin who spoke and wrote nothing but French, the native Anglo-Saxon writers themselves made efforts to write in French (Robert Grosseteste, Peter de Langtolf, etc.). The consequence is that, at the end of the 14th century, we find scarcely a trace of Anglo-Saxon literature. The laws themselves were composed and promulgated in French until the reign of Henry VIII.¹ Not content with absorbing that French culture which was entering all the pores of public

¹ An Act of Parliament of 1731 even thought it worth while to forbid absolutely the use of French in certain forms of judicial procedure and certain public ceremonies, which proves that traces of it were to be found up to the 18th century.

and intellectual life on their own side of the Channel, the Anglo-Saxons accustomed themselves to going to the University of Paris to finish their studies. Even in the 19th century they were to be found in greater numbers there than students from any other country.

What helped forward the triumph of the French language more than anything else was the fact which is to-day uncontested, that it had made its way into England long before the Conquest. According to the chronicles of Ingulphus (11th century), French was the chief language spoken at the court of Edward the Confessor, who, after living for some years in Normandy, brought back with him French taste and the use of the French language. His devotion to France led him still further : he introduced into England a number of Normans, on whom he bestowed the highest honours. In this way French became the fashionable tongue ; and all the nobles, as Ingulphus tells us, used it with the object of distinguishing themselves from men of lower rank.

The French plant will thus strike its roots deeper and deeper into English soil, enriching it as it grows. It will change the character of the ground and bring it to its highest point of fertility. Henceforward everything that grows will contain a piece of France. Every manifestation of life will be impregnated with it, its political constitution as well as its poetry, its romances as well as its philosophy, its science together with its arts. But the influx of French culture did not mean

the destruction of what was peculiar to England. Superimposed like a layer of rich protecting earth, it allowed the English plant to grow imperceptibly under its shelter, until, fully developed and mature, the latter was able to subsist in its own strength, when, far from eliminating its former benefactor, it would keep it in its house and try to appropriate for all time the treasure of its teachings and its ideas.

As Anglo-Saxon language and literature developed it borrowed more and more the principles of French prosody, the words of our vocabulary, and the ideas of the polished, refined culture of France. These ideas instilled themselves into it in great abundance, renewing and embellishing the rude tongue of the Anglo-Saxon tribes, making it richer and more and more harmonious. Anglo-Saxon literature of the 14th century contains scarcely anything but translations of romances of chivalry. In the 15th century many poets write the first half of the line in English and the second in French. The native writers ennoble their emotions by contact with Gallic masterpieces, and accustom themselves to flying like young birds under the affectionate gaze of their elders; and into their translations French words enter, sometimes with all their primitive grace, impossible to render into the native language, at other times in an anglicised form, yet retaining the delicious perfume of their origin. The number of these words is so great that Skeat's well-known "Etymological Dictionary" shows twice

as many words of French (and Latin) origin in the English language as words of Germanic origin. Hume ("History of England," vol. i.)¹ also thought that the greater part of the English language and its chief beauties were derived from the French. In other words, the English language, grafted on the French, spread, without desiring it, the glory of Gallic speech throughout the world. The necessity of competing with French compelled Anglo-Saxon to simplify itself. Thanks to this simplification, it became the easiest and the most readily acquired language in the world. Moreover, the habit of borrowing on a large scale which the new language early contracted gave it a rare elasticity and a wonderful power of self-enrichment. Its grammar as well as its syntax was reduced to the simplest expressions. "By means of their influence one upon the other both languages got rid of their arbitrary genders: everything male was said to be masculine, everything female feminine; everything else was neuter. The declension of adjectives disappeared (so Jusserand tells us) and the auxiliaries which were introduced into the conjugation of verbs made it clearer and less awkward." When it is a matter of touching on prosody it will be seen with what discernment the first English writers worked,

¹ To get an idea of the preponderating part played by French in the formation of the English language and grammar, the reader may consult M. H. Moisy's curious "Glossaire Comparatif Anglo-Normand" or M. Kaluza's "Historische Grammatik."

who, like Chaucer, contributed so powerfully to its emancipation. It may be said that these writers always had their eyes fixed on the qualities of French verse and prose. Anglo-Saxon lines had the same number of accented syllables ; French lines consisted of the same number of syllables having equal sonority. The new English prosody, having recourse to two sources from which it might draw poetry, borrowed the characteristics of both, and thus put at the disposal of England's future poets both French rhyme and Anglo-Saxon accent. Under the influence of the French language and by the absorption of its riches, the tongue of Shakespeare and Byron not only gained in rigorous precision, but also drew from the wonderful riches of its vocabulary incomparable beauties of expression. English prosody became more and more supple, and the English vocabulary as it increased showed itself to be at once the richest and the most adaptable. The poets and writers of England, from the very origin of their language and literature, have thus laid themselves under permanent debt to France—a debt which is all the more unforgettable in that it constantly recalls to their memory with each word they write, every word they hear or with every page what their masters have left to them.

(c) *Interpenetration of Two Souls.*

But the influence of the Frenchmen who came to England with Duke William did not stop here. An equally complete penetration of the two peoples one by the other was of necessity to make an impression which centuries would not remove. Biology has proved that a widow, on remarrying a long time after the death of her first husband, often gives birth to children with a striking resemblance to him. The fact is that a life lived together makes an impression upon and transforms the most remote organs. What shall we say then to the interpenetration of ideas which has been in operation between the French and the Anglo-Saxon souls for so many succeeding centuries? National peculiarities have grown less marked; thoughts have drawn closer together; English and French, apart from the influences of environment and historical events which of necessity have fashioned them externally, have inclined instinctively towards a union of perfect harmony.

From the facts given above the following theory may be deduced: that the first and the most important *rapprochement* between the English and the French, though begun under the brutal form of the Conquest, has had the most happy consequences for England's future. To it are owing her national consciousness, her language and prosody, as well as the very foundations of her future civilisation. To it

she owes, in addition to its manifest services, debts of gratitude more difficult to discover, but none the less important. A notable example is the indirect influence which the Conqueror's army exercised on the civic independence of the English people and in that way on the English Constitution and the freedom of ideas of English citizens.

(d) *Benefits of the Norman Invasion.*

William acted as a conqueror and divided the lands of England among his knights. As a master of his booty, it was for him to dictate terms to those whom he wished to benefit by his generosity. His vassals therefore received the lands on conditions which differed in severity from those which bound the vassals to the King of France.

Thus from the 11th century onwards the English barons were less powerful than those of the Continent. The latter held their possessions by way of limitation and in virtue of rights often more worthy of respect and more ancient than those of their sovereign masters. The result, which is of great significance for the history of England, was that the English barons, being much weaker, could never raise revolts or revolutions on their own account. Every time they had the desire of fighting against the power of the King they found it necessary to seek the support of the townspeople and farmers. In this way every triumph they obtained over the royal power could be ascribed equally to

the credit of the lower orders. And in order to teach the people the lessons of revolt which they never ceased to give them the English nobles were compelled to teach them also their rights as men and citizens. United thus in their demands, they opposed their common enemy the King, and shared in brotherly fashion the fruits of their victories. The Magna Charta, it is true, favoured the nobles, but it did not forget the English people altogether. Hallam sagaciously and rightly says in his "Middle Ages" that the equal distribution of rights to all free men was the chief characteristic of this great legislative act. In 1264 the English aristocracy openly appealed to the inhabitants of the towns and boroughs to assist them in defending the common cause. The people were considered as a necessary part in the machinery of government; they became conscious of their strength, their usefulness, and above all of their rights of citizenship. In future they would see to it that these rights were preserved with jealous care and would toil unceasingly to extend them. From the year 1307 onwards, Guizot tells us in his essays, the laws which were to bring about free government in England were given definite recognition.

In this connection it is enough to compare the history of France and England to understand all the advantages which the latter was able to obtain from the exceptional situation which resulted from the French invasion.

In mediæval Europe a deep gulf separated the common people from the nobility. England, under an appearance of aristocracy, in reality formed a collection of free citizens. Social inequalities in England are no more than outward privileges ; in no way do they indicate an essential difference in the sum of liberties.

In France the common people waited several centuries before it succeeded in bringing about the situation in which her English neighbour rejoiced. As we shall see farther on, the Great Revolution, whose fruits are so precious to us, broke out and ended victoriously, thanks to England's influence. But this attainment of liberties, in which England preceded France by many centuries, had a great influence on the formation of the English character. Under the kindly reign of liberty the English gained individualism, confidence in themselves, and a sort of distrust of tutelary government. The French, on the other hand, became and were for long the victims of excessive centralisation, which for many years diminished the strength of their character and their spirit of initiative.

The facts I have given are enough to show what decisive weight the political contact of the two peoples had on the formation of the English character.

These salutary and undying effects remind one of the helpful influences of certain constellations of which the ancients used to speak. England

seems to have been born under a star representing Jacques Bonhomme, just as France seems to have been born under that of John Bull. Let us pass to the successive formation of each country's mentality.

(e) *The Evolution of the English Genius.*

English literature was not only born under the influence of French literature: it also grew under it. The great poet Chaucer, whose glory it was to have freed the literature of his country from foreign influence, was nourished by French writers and thinkers. In spite of the fact that he wrote in English, his French education and his youthful enthusiasms can be clearly perceived through his writing. His was an eminently French mind. All the subjects of French satire are to be found in his works: marriage, religion, and the rest. Some of his pages are worthy of those profoundly French writers Rabelais and Molière.

Certain critics of Chaucer seem anxious to insinuate that his liking for French (his Anglo-French language also) was peculiar to him (Verstegan¹). But Tyrwhitt, to whom England is indebted for the best edition of the great poet's works, answered with truth that "if Chaucer's language had not corresponded to the English of his time, he would never have succeeded in becoming a great national poet, not only the most

¹ Chaucer was a great mingler of English with French, etc. Verstegan attributes his immoderate passion for French to his French origin.

popular but also the most admired writer of his time and country."

Just as the English nation was able to build upon French foundations the virtues of its own land and of the Anglo-Saxon race, so Chaucer was able, from his profound understanding of man and nature, to raise the truth above his century and yet place it in relation with the conventions of gallantry and monasticism of the time. His evident devotion to Deschamps and Granson is a clear proof of a deep gratitude towards those writers, who formed his talent and guided his first steps. When, later, English literature of the 16th century made efforts to renew itself by having recourse to Latin and Greek classics, we shall notice that the taste for these studies also came from France.

If, instead of seeking out remote instances of interpenetration, we confine ourselves to more concrete influences, we shall find them in those illustrious writers whose genius is considered to be the essence of the English soul, Shakespeare, for example. And yet how much Shakespeare's genius owes to France, not only because he profited by all the blessings of her civilisation, but also because his muse refreshed herself at the French stream and returned deeper and more human.

The work of the immortal Will has two phases. The first ends and the second begins at the moment when he became acquainted with the writings of Montaigne. This moment marked a decisive

revolution in his mind. It was as if a new horizon had opened before his eyes. Up to 1603 the poet had only written his "Two Gentlemen of Verona," "The Comedy of Errors," "Pericles," and "Romeo and Juliet." Then came Florio's translation of Montaigne. Shakespeare was enraptured. At last he had discovered his favourite master. On his way he had seen the divine light which henceforth was to illuminate all his life's road. Vast perspectives open before his genius. He sets to work with delight and produces undying works which have made him the poet of the whole of humanity. From this time onwards Shakespeare is conscious of doubts; he is roused from his lyric calm; he begins to observe humanity, to examine its problems, and to take pity on its lot. Only after having made the acquaintance of Montaigne does he write "Othello," "The Tempest," "King Lear," "Macbeth," "Antony and Cleopatra," and "Hamlet." Philarète Chasles, in his book "England in the 16th Century," made the singular and just remark that even Shakespeare's style was transformed after this memorable date in the poet's evolution. "Previously it was the imitation of Petrarch, of Ariosto, which could be seen in him; after 1603 this copying of attractive Italian examples disappeared." Let us not forget that from this time there are no more interwoven rhymes, no more sonnets, no more conceits. Montaigne is to be found in every corner of "Othello," of "Hamlet," of

"Coriolanus." A German critic, Jacob Feis, has even attempted to prove that "Hamlet" was written with the sole object of opposing certain of Montaigne's opinions. John Sterling was of the opinion that "Hamlet" was only Montaigne actuated by certain striking, vital motives.¹ Mr. John Robertson in his book on "Montaigne and Shakespeare" tells us that Montaigne's "Essay on Solitude" left a particular mark on Shakespeare's inner life and shaped it according to the French moralist's favourite precepts.

With his supreme gift of understanding, Shakespeare selected the most beautiful, profound, and human of maxims and made them part of his work. In "The Tempest" is to be found a complete translation of the celebrated passage on "Cannibales" ("Essais," LIV. chap. i., p. 30). It is noteworthy that the same ideas which later called forth the delight of Pascal and the enthusiasm of Jean-Jacques were those which most struck the imagination of Shakespeare.

To use Sainte Beuve's expression, there are many English writers who have had "du Montaigne" in them.

Let us take the celebrated Sir Thomas Browne, the first English humorist among all those who so greatly influenced English literature and thought

¹ " Lifted to a higher eminence and agitated by more striking circumstances" (*London and Westminster Review*, July, 1838).

during the 17th and 18th centuries. His "Religio Medici," which has delighted generation after generation across the Channel and has made so many writers in each country, was conceived and written under Montaigne's influence. And yet Browne's work is one of the most original productions of the 17th century. Imagination, science, humour, the prepossessions of the metaphysician, fond of abstractions, and those of the sociologist, attentive to the present, the ideas of a man a believer by tradition and a sceptic by the cast of his mind—all these are heaped up and intermixed, making a most delightful philosophic whole and one of the most vigorous and most tragic works which have ever been written in any language. From his ready pen, sarcastic and yet tender, flow for the first time words of doubt, dangerous opinions on all things—opinions which Browne, with a scepticism like Montaigne's, whom he imitated in the arrangement of his essays, never claimed to be "true." He will merely offer them as having no other merit than that of being the expression of his own candid, modest thinking. And his contemporaries were thus obliged to meditate with him on the bizarre ideas of a man who did not believe in eternal punishment, nor that the world was created in six days, nor, what was more serious, that the God of Moses was perfection itself. And by the doubts which he expressed of the everlasting fires he put in question at the same time the

triumphs of the saints and taught his countrymen the lessons of "supreme tolerance."

Both Ronsard and Du Bartas had enthusiastic admirers in England ; so had the French collections of tragic and licentious stories. The English "amorists" drew their inspiration from French poets. The flaming and consuming love which was sung in France in crossing the Channel gained something of the melancholy fogs of the island and ended its evolution with Donne, the Dean of St. Paul's, in his idealisation of that sad and gloomy love which has dregs at the bottom, like the bouquet of certain old wines.

Voltaire declared, according to the conversation which Brunet is said to have had with him, that Bourdaloue had reformed the preachers of England as he had reformed those of France. M. F. Brunière, in his "Roman Naturaliste," even supports the novel thesis that Bourdaloue contributed to the artistic evolution of Richardson and his works and masterpieces.

Under the Restoration the reign of French taste did not come to an end in England. The members of the nobility whom Cromwell had driven away retired to France, where they learnt to espouse French ideas and tastes. France eventually became the model of the court, and Charles II. took everything from the hands of Louis XIV., even to a mistress. According to Taine, in his "History of English Literature," vol. iii., it is evident in the

works of English writers of the time that French authors are their masters and are to be found in the hands of all well-educated people. The most polished try to be entirely French and to mix scraps of French sentences in their speech. Even in the Augustan age of English literature all eyes were to be turned in the direction of Paris. It is true that the depravity of taste which then prevailed made an exact choice among French authors difficult. Instead of drawing from the inexhaustible sources of French genius, therefore, writers paid court to mediocre minds and imitated the works of Mademoiselle de Scudéry or of de Calprenède. Lee was inspired by the latter's "Cassandre"; Dryden drew from the former's "Almahide." Nevertheless the French mind made its way to the other side of the Channel and continually renewed English thought and literature. For in this world-wide enthusiasm for France and the French there was always room for Molière, whom Wycherley adapted to English tastes, and for Racine and Corneille, who were to be seized upon by Pope and the group of writers who made up his following.

The philosophers Bacon and Hobbes, so essentially English, were both intimately connected with French thought: they praised it for its seriousness and acknowledged its decisive influence on their manner of thinking and writing. In "Bayle's incomparable dictionary" (Locke) the majority of English sceptics in the 18th century were

constantly seeking and finding new weapons. Later, Rousseau was to bring forth English romanticism, of which he would remain the uncontested master. From him there came Cowper, addressing him in passionate lines, Shelley, calling himself Rousseau's intellectual son, and Byron, whose admiration was to last as long as his life. George Eliot, the most brilliant novelist of modern England, exclaimed in a moment of gratitude: "It is Rousseau who vivified my soul."

(f) *Reciprocal Friendship and Admiration.*

Writers, statesmen, philosophers, historians, workers, all acknowledge the benefits of this brotherly penetration of English civilisation by French thought. And when England's national consciousness is not darkened by the mean interests of everyday quarrels it will acknowledge with gratitude the debt which England owes to France. A poet like Wordsworth does not hesitate to reprove a bishop like Watson for having dared to attack France and for having thus "aimed an arrow at liberty and philosophy, the eyes of the human race." The same Wordsworth exults in his soul when his English fellow-countrymen are conquered by the French, for "humanity, which is France, thus triumphs over England, which is only a part of humanity." Nearly all the great English poets yield in nothing to Wordsworth in their passionate love for France and the French people.

The noble sentiments which were abundantly expressed on the English side in the course of time found a powerful echo in France. English thought, matured and enlarged under French influence, reached France in the 18th century and there discovered the ground ready prepared for its reception and cultivation. English travellers follow it, and feelings long repressed now burst forth on both sides of the Channel. Just as a rushing torrent, breaking all artificial restraints, makes its way to unsuspected regions, so English thought, once established in France, penetrates everywhere, leaving an indelible mark on French national life.

At the sight of this splendid communion of souls Buckle, a practised observer, in his astonishment classes this "phenomenon of the union of two civilisations" as one of the most momentous events of the 18th century.

II.

WHAT FRANCE OWES TO ENGLAND.

"The hell of demons and parricides, which serves as a habitation for a people which, though full of rage, is nevertheless stupid and of a Northern cast of mind," according to the Jesuit Father Goulon, author of the first "French Guide to England" (1654), was in its turn to pay its debt of gratitude to France and the French. One will note above all that true humanity, which consists in love towards

and comprehension of other peoples, that essential characteristic of the French mentality, first came to France from England.

Eighteenth century France, the France of the Encyclopædists, of the Revolution, of complete faith in humanity and its battle for freedom and the abolition of despotism—this France owes much to the influence of the English.

Let us not forget that for a whole century, the 17th, France kept herself apart from other nations, and maintained continuous relations with no other people but the English. And let us say without fear of contradiction that the most enviable claims which the French mind and French glory can make sprang from the beneficent influence of England.

(a) *Formation of Genius.*

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes gave Great Britain thousands of educated Frenchmen. The enlightened Huguenots crossed over to England in order to taste "the fruits of liberty in a free air." All they knew of this country had been of evil report. If France was adored by the English, England was besmirched and despised by all whom France accounted notable. Even at this time our neighbours had in France their implacable detractors, drawn from every circle. People knew neither England nor the English language, but this fact did not prevent them from despising both. The

lines of Saint Amand, who, in his "Albion," asserted that "ignorance and arrogance formed the sum-total of their manners," accurately reflected the opinion of the time. We should not forget that no French translation of Shakespeare appeared until 1776, and that all that was commonly known of English literature in France at the beginning of the 18th century was confined to the works of Bacon, Godwin's "Man in the Moon," and certain other books of less importance.

The blind hatred which the royalty, the nobility, and the clergy entertained towards England had a cruelty about it like destiny. The Roi Soleil wished to see melt away this "nation of murderers," which dared to attack the monarchy and its divine rights. The nearness of this nation, "more agitated in its land and in its ports than the ocean which surrounded it" (Bossuet), made the nobility tremble and caused the clergy much trepidation. Writers in the pay of Louis XIV. as well as courtiers who moved in the orbit of his favours were fond of cursing English cruelty and barbarism. This unreasoning hate was such that, according to Sprengel in his "History of Medicine," quinine was discredited in France until the end of the 17th century on the pretext that it was a drug favoured by the English. The clergy everywhere showed great indignation at the sight of a people which held religion, as well as many of its earthly privileges, so cheap.

In France blood flowed in torrents in disputes about divine dogmas or their alleged equivalents ; in England the struggle was always for earthly liberty, even though its outward form was religious strife. Henry VIII. by his will alone regulated the nation's religion and drew up the formulas of the Church. Edward, who succeeded him, overthrew the Catholic doctrine established by his father and brought about the triumph of Protestantism. Queen Mary, born a Papist, destroyed the Protestant achievements of her father and proclaimed the victory of Catholicism. But Elizabeth ascended the throne immediately afterwards, swept away the idols of Queen Mary, and brought about the disappearance of Catholicism and Catholics. The English people looked on unmoved at this series of religious transformations, which their indifference was all the time facilitating and encouraging (Locke's works, vol. v.). Of what account to them were the religious aspirations of their sovereigns, provided that the domain of their liberties was extended and helped forward? In the eyes of enlightened Frenchmen, accustomed as they were to the sight of heart-breaking tragedies caused by the least deviation from the established religion, England became the promised land of liberty of conscience.

The refugees on their arrival were astounded at the treasures of English thought and intellect, and, with the vivacity and impressionableness

which characterise the French mind, they quickly passed from admiration to "penetration" of this new state of soul and to comprehension of unknown masterpieces. They soon seized upon what there was of injustice and stupidity in the systematic ignorance of the insular mind and then began to repair the wrongs of centuries. Their feverish labour soon bore fruit. France was invaded by the most splendid achievements of the English intellect. Drama, novel, poetry, newspapers, philosophy, science—nothing was neglected. There were translations and summaries, not merely of well-known works; every little nook and corner of the intellectual life of the country beyond the Channel was explored, and discoveries were often made to the advantage of the English themselves.

At about the same time Rapin de Thoiras published a "History of the English Parliament." It was received with enthusiasm, and made a profound impression on the best intellects of the time. The assembly of the Saxons, the Witenagemot, became the ideal of English free institutions.

The echo of this was to be heard later in the works of Montesquieu. The author of the "Esprit des Lois" at first showed great reserve in his judgment of English organisation, which to him recalled that of Sparta or of the small Italian republics of the Middle Ages. But he afterwards showed great enthusiasm for the English government, half aristocratic, half *bourgeois*, founded on tradition and ancient customs.

Without the French, without Rapin de Thoiras, as L. Blanc points out in his "Letters," the English would never have had any general history of their nation. Thus, if the new-comers owed much to England, they paid back their debt of gratitude very generously. They made England known and admired not only in France, but also throughout the rest of Europe. Owing to their efforts, Locke, Newton, Shakespeare, Richardson, were appreciated throughout the whole world. Having once become travellers telling the world of the greatness of England, the French filled this post with intelligence and to the advantage of the whole of humanity.

In this way Europe, thanks to the French, learnt of the benefits of the English parliamentary system. Until the beginning of the 18th century England was only spoken of in Europe as "regicide England"; as a result of the efforts of French refugees, people now began to know and to praise "constitutional England."

Moreover, it was thanks to her and because of her that the French people began to take a greater interest in foreign affairs and give free course to their dreams of equality and fraternity.

A decisive step was thus taken in the national life of France. Henceforward she would not be content to remain merely curious in regard to events occurring outside her borders; she would take part in them and finally open her heart to nations imbued with

the same ideas and anxious to create a public life worthy of free men.

"Towards the year 1720 a kind of intimacy sprang up between the French mind and the English, an intimacy which was to produce a wholesome effect on the future of the two countries."¹ Our gazetteers were particularly noteworthy in their efforts to bring the thoughts of the two nations together and unite them within the domain of a humanitarian literature. Let us recall, among others, the "Memoirs of a Man of Quality," by the Abbé Prévost—that veritable introduction to the life of all civilised peoples.

Rousseau displayed unlimited admiration for England, although later he modified his sentiments a little after having had an unfavourable reception there. Love for England became so general that the pamphleteers at the end of the 18th century thought fit to impugn all the Anglomaniacs of the National Assembly, such men as Necker, Monnier, Lally, Malouet, and all the fatal descendants of Montesquieu. But an ineffaceable impression had been made. Henceforward France would always bear the stamp of English influence.

The French nation was thus revolutionised by its contact with England. The prodigious development of the 18th century which ended in the Great Revolution took its course under the influence

¹ See my study on "The Formation of the French Mind" in *La Revue*, July 1st, 1898.

of England. After the long reign of Louis XIV., who had exhausted the country materially and morally, France felt the need of regeneration. The sap of her genius was impoverished by centuries of labour, and to regain its vigour it was necessary to find something which should vivify and strengthen it. It was to England that the honour fell of strengthening her thought and of pouring into her bloodless system new floods of life. This absorption of English civilisation was followed by miraculous results.

(b) *England and the Great Revolution.*

It should never be forgotten that it was not only the novel and philosophy which drew inspiration from English sources, but that men of action as well, the revolutionaries of the morrow, breathed in air from the surrounding atmosphere, which had been created by the influx of English ideas, English notions of equality and of social and political enfranchisement. The memoirs of the time describe the respect in which all the principal figures of the Great Revolution were accustomed to hold English scholars, English statesmen, English doctrines, and the English nation in general. And this admiration brought with it an ardent desire to transplant into French soil the achievements which England had attained. Danton was imbued with English ideas. Before mounting the scaffold he turned to Young's "Night Thoughts," so that he might

"die honourably." Camille Desmoulins, Mounier, Lafayette, Mirabeau, Brissot, and the other leaders of the Revolution seemed familiar with English language, literature, and history. All those who had not the pleasure of knowing that "tongue of liberty" drew from books at second hand a love for the common people and the courage to conquer in a battle fought in the name of their rights.

It was in this way that, little by little, France of the *ancien régime* underwent modification. The irruption of new ideas was so violent that all the breakwaters of the past were swept away. One might say that the soul of France was changed in the space of about fifty years. She had once been respectful towards the rights of the Church, of royalty, and the nobility; she now began to show an independence of opinion which was a sign of the coming tempest. When the Cromwellian revolution and that of 1789 are compared, one is astonished to see how many resemblances there are between them. It might even be said that France owed her limitless faith in the power and capability of the people to the eloquent lesson which had been given her forty years before by the victory of the people of England.

The English tatterdemalions first gave the impulse to this movement, which was to make the edifice of society tremble and bring its lowly supporters to the surface. The parts once reversed, the English were even anxious to break down all those barriers which might compromise the new laws of social

stability. Thus the royal power was destroyed and an attempt made to sweep away the House of Lords. And, just as later in France, it was the sons of the people who took possession of the highest situations and astonished the world by their unsuspected capabilities: a common coachman became colonel (Ride) ; a footboy (Okey) attained the same rank ; a draper's traveller became a general (Whelley) ; a servant (Jones, Cromwell's brother-in-law) became an equally eminent soldier ; butcher-boys (Salway, Venn, Tichborne, etc.) commanded the army brilliantly. All were bold and courageous leaders, a living example to future generations. The English people, as it beheld the men issued from its loins who, without tradition or previous education, knew how to hold up their heads among the great warriors and before the Almighty, conceived a just pride in the nation's valour and an illimitable confidence in her future. It is enough to recall the events of the French Revolution to perceive how this or that particular incident in many a case was inspired by the tragic story of Cromwell. Traces of this inspiration were found among us even to the point of regicide.

To draw inspiration from a source does not in the least mean imitation. The Great Revolution, which was conceived at another time and under different circumstances, overturned the whole of humanity, because it was before everything human ; the English Revolution was merely English. But

can one forget, even when standing before the vast waters of the ocean, the modest streams which contribute to its greatness? It is indisputable that the English Revolution was to some extent the god-mother of the Revolution of 1789. And this contact between the two peoples once more had the most happy consequences for the future of humanity.

In the 18th century France continued to suffer social inequalities, but it was clear that the growing discontent was only waiting for an opportune moment to overthrow the privileges which royalty and the three orders had held for centuries.

When America freed herself from the English yoke France rejoiced, not in the disaster to her neighbour, but in the triumph of liberty. She became delirious with joy on hearing of the American Declaration by which the Government was reduced to the simple *rôle* of "a servant of the people." The encouragement given to those struggling for liberty became so great that Louis XVI. was himself forced to go to the assistance of the very people who were bringing his divine rights to an end.

(c) *Intellectual France and English Influence.*

If one now passes from the ranks of the people to the representative personalities of the 18th century the effects of English influence become clearer and more precise. Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, philosophers, scholars, men of letters, all allow themselves to be penetrated by English ideas, and

submit willingly or by compulsion to the influence of those ideas. The "Lettres Anglaises" of Voltaire, which Condorcet considered to have marked a turning point, a revolution, were not written until after his visit to England. This was the decisive moment of his life. From this date the poet was transformed into a thinker and philosopher. "The spirit of the century," as J. Texte rightly says in his "J. J. Rousseau," "which had sought itself for some thirty years, found itself in this book." The "Lettres Anglaises" are the letters of the 18th century's majority. The liking for things English in the history of literature developed into a positive frenzy. The fire kindled by Voltaire's enthusiasm grew to a simply prodigious height.

Later, his pride as a French writer being wounded, Voltaire made vain efforts to stop the movement. The literary public turned from its favourite guide to follow the Anglomaniacs and their idols. The Encyclopædists paid homage to the English novel, which they placed far above the works of French authors. Buffon even went so far as to claim that the truth of nature was to be found in Richardson. "Diderot is entirely English," declares Brunetièrre ("Les Epoques du Théâtre Français"). He did not merely pass his life in preaching the gospel of English thought and the English people; he also appropriated their peculiar virtues, and these in his work shine with numerous and novel attractions. Original as was his genius as thinker and

stylist, he never ceased to trace its growth to English roots, as if this intellectual descent would ennoble his creation. In turn he unceasingly proclaimed his masters to be Richardson and Lillo, Sterne and Moore, Fielding and Addison. Diderot's enthusiastic eulogy on Richardson should be read by anyone who wishes to understand how by direct inspiration he allowed himself to write the "Religieuse," which has been called a variation of "Clarissa Harlowe." To this latter novel Diderot owed the "Histoire de Mademoiselle de la Chaux" or the "Deux Amis de Bourbonne." And for a good reason! Remember his heartfelt cry: "I know Harlowe's house as I do my own; my father's home is not more familiar to me than that of Grandison" (Diderot, "Eloge de Richardson"). What might not other French writers have said when a writer as profound, as original, and as brilliant as Diderot found it hardly sufficient praise to compare Richardson's novel with the Gospel and its author "with Moses, Homer, Euripides, and Sophocles"?

The English fashion was so irresistible and English influence so tremendously powerful that France was overwhelmed by a deluge of novels written in the English style. French authors (among others Crébillon *fils* , who did so with the object of assuring the success of his "Heureux Orphelins") brought out their works as translations from the English. The Abbé Prévost gave an English stamp to his "Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire

de la Vertu." And, in addition to the novelists, poets like Young, Thompson, and many others demanded their share of influence. Their profound melancholy charmed the French mind and brought it pleasures hitherto unknown.

The world of literature had never before been so united in its worship. England had performed the miracle of bringing a sceptical and scornful France to adore the same divinity—sensibility and the English genius. Rousseau, the immortal Rousseau, was perhaps more subject than anyone else to this influence from beyond the Channel. "His *bourgeois* novel 'Julie,' his eloquence of the heart, his tone of sentiment, as Freron maintained, all came to him from Richardson." His genius before it ascended above worlds and centuries drew inspiration from Defoe, whom Rousseau placed higher than Aristotle and Buffon. He drew natural philosophy from Robinson, and was intoxicated with enthusiastic delight at "Pamela" and "Clarissa Harlowe." What Rousseau was to be later to Goethe ("Nouvelle Héloïse," "Werther") Richardson was to Rousseau ("Clarissa," "Nouvelle Héloïse"), according to the thesis so brilliantly maintained by Marc Monier. "'Clarissa,'" said Rousseau, "contains a complete picture of the human race." Bernardin de St. Pierre, La Harpe, Grimm, and Diderot make many unkind comparisons between Rousseau and Richardson, to the disadvantage of the former. And yet, whatever may be the resem-

blance between them, Rousseau's genius suffers nothing in the eyes of posterity. Of what account is the origin of the materials which he used to create his masterpieces if their divine beauty is seen in all its purity of creative originality? Geniuses scarcely ever invent. If the writings of the most wonderful creative artists, such as Æschylus, Sophocles, Dante, Shakespeare, Molière, and so many others, are analysed, it is astonishing to see how little originality there was in the plots of their works. The whole plot of the "Divine Comedy" is to be found in the rhymed visions of the Friar Alberic of Mont Cassin. Everything is here, even including the threefold kingdom of souls in damnation, in bliss, and in purgatory. Shakespeare found his "King John" in an old play, "The Unhappy Reign of John," and his "King Lear" in another old play of the end of the 16th century, his "Comedy of Errors" in the "Menaechmi" of Plautus, his "Romeo and Juliet" in the Italian story-writers. Molière took his material from Cyrano de Bergerac or from Plautus, just as Æschylus and Sophocles had found their material in Homer. Without desiring to lessen the immortal glory of their creations, criticism cannot omit to praise the virtues of those who helped to raise these monuments of beauty and of truth. Moreover, the case of Richardson and the English is of a glory entirely different from that due to a man who modestly lends a tool to help in an immortal creation. To them was

owing not only the plot of the *bourgeois* novel, but also something wider—the comprehension of human feeling. And further they obtained for people of humble life the right of bringing to the light of day and of bedewing with tears their moral sufferings and betrayals of the heart.

A new soul-world was thus appropriated by the novel. Rousseau, with his acute sensibility and profound genius, was able to turn this purely English gain into a gain for humanity in general. Above all, he succeeded in adding to it nature, which the English lacked. This is why Richardson and his followers are to some extent forgotten while Rousseau remains supreme in the midst of writers inspired by him or of imitators blindly following the suspended action of his genius. From him proceed the French literature of our time and that universal literature which thus became tributary to France. Yet while worshipping one of the most glorious of her children, to whom she owes the generation of works such as “Adolphe” and “René,” France cannot forget those who contributed to his birth, his merits, and his glory.

The romanticism which changed French culture began in England. As Taine declared, Young and his contemporaries said before Chateaubriand and Lamartine what these two writers were to discover later. “The true and the false were to be found in England forty years earlier than in France. The angels and the other celestial machines had played

their part in England a long time before they invaded the 'Génie du Christianisme' and the 'Martyrs.' "

(d) *What of Germany ?*

The benefits of an Anglo-French collaboration of ideas consisting in the reciprocal increase of their moral and intellectual heritage become yet more astonishing and yet more extraordinary when they are compared with the results of Franco-German or Anglo-German age-long relations.

The comparative history of national literatures tells us that if Germany contracted incalculable debts in France, she has not yet found an opportunity of paying them back. The deception of her philosophers and historians, beginning with Auguste Wilhelm Schlegel and ending with modern anthropologists and political writers, once unmasked,¹ what remains of her real claims to have contributed to the beauty and moral grandeur of progress ?

It is incontestable that the first impulses of the chief currents of culture of which Germany once boasted first came from France. They must therefore be put to the credit of the French.

Let us leave aside the Dark Ages of history. But beginning with Charlemagne, French influence made its way into all manifestations of German life. The civilisation of the Middle Ages, with all the flower of its life and literature, which Germany has

¹ See *La Revue*, November, 1914, " L'Ame allemande."

never ceased to attribute to herself, was really of French origin. Feudalism and chivalry, with their developments, the refinement of manners and the incomparable treasures of literature, made their way into Germany, after having first germinated and fermented in France. The poetry of the Minnesingers is only a development of the "courtly" poetry of France. The Gothic style which Germany adopted to her advantage is essentially French; at the time of its introduction into Germany the Germans themselves called it by no other name than *opus Francigenum*. The Universities of Germany were founded in imitation of models created in France; the epic poems of which Germany is so proud—these, too, came from the other side of the Rhine. "Lohengrin," "Parsifal," "Tristan and Iseult," are, as Gaston Paris has shown, entirely French; even Gothic writing is not a Germanic creation: it was born on French soil.

This has been the case throughout the epochs of German history. After the Thirty Years' War, when Germany was divided into an infinitesimal number of small territories, she almost lost her individuality and was only able to save it by turning to France. The latter obtained for her the leading ideas of a political and intellectual renaissance. French influence was so considerable in Prussia that Frederick II., the king of whom modern Prussia is so proud, declared that it was a sheer waste of time to learn German.

The prodigious evolution of Protestant pietism in Germany took its rise under the influence of St. François de Sales (L. Reynaud). Recent work on the origin of French romanticism has shown the decisive influence which Rousseau exercised even on minds such as Goethe's. The latter's "Werther," which revolutionised Germany, was written under the direct inspiration of the "Nouvelle Héloïse." Goethe inclined, moreover, to admire Diderot, Voltaire, Racine, to say nothing of Shakespeare, with that eclecticism of refined taste which knows how to pick out and make its own the beauty it has met with in others. What, finally, shall we say of Lessing, who openly acknowledged his debt to Diderot and Voltaire?

The influence of Shakespeare on German literature has been such that the Germans of to-day are obliged to annex him as one of themselves, as the true ancestor of their literature for the last few centuries. But here again it was Voltaire who opened up for their use the treasures of English drama and poetry—Shakespeare and Milton. The first national awakening of Germany, the romanticism let loose by Herder, which drew in its wake both Goethe and Schiller, was effected under the combined influence of Jean-Jacques and Diderot.

The claims of Germany in the domain of general culture are undoubtedly considerable. But they are in the last resort confined to erudition and the practical utilisation of discoveries made elsewhere.

Except Goethe, Schiller, and Heine—the last, by the way, openly French—her writers may quite well not have existed without the literary heritage of humanity being diminished. In philosophy she can only show us Kant, Leibnitz, and Schopenhauer. As for the Kantian morality, the most shining star of her doctrine, it has ended by falling into nothingness. Its categorical imperative, which tried to make men demi-gods, can only float in the sphere of the unreal, between heaven and earth.

The Germans of to-day, who have descended to the lowest scale of humanity, have furnished the best proof of the fictitious value of the Kantian philosophy. By improving upon Christian dogma Kant introduced into the moral order the creation of something “colossal” which had nothing in common with human nature.¹

But a moral philosophy, like every other system of life, must be judged by its results, and if not realised it should at least be realisable. Leibnitz would be inconceivable without Descartes. What has remained of Hegel after Schopenhauer’s decisive triumph over him? Germany, by appropriating the achievements of others, has, according to M. Boutroux’s happy phrase, only succeeded in producing “learned barbarism.” After having borrowed the building materials from other nations,

¹ Our criticism of Kantian morality, as by a sublime but regrettable mistake, dates from 1908. See the “Science du Bonheur,” 12th edition (Fayard).

Germany, instead of making temples of them, has only been able to erect barracks.

France, England, and other civilised countries would have been able to evolve without Germany and German culture. Without Claude Bernard, Berthelot, Pasteur, Lister, Lamarck, Darwin, and hundreds of other thinkers, poets, scholars, and inventors, Germany could never even have perfected her applied science, of which she makes such a boast.

To humble German pride, it should be sufficient to compare the number and value of her so-called eternal creators in all departments with those offered us not only by France and England, but also by the Italians, the Russians, or the small Scandinavian nations.

(e) *The Parallel Evolution of the Two Peoples.*

The rhythm of the historical evolution of France and England presents striking analogies. Their intellectual development often recalls that of twin-brothers, subject to the influence of a common destiny. Both move, keeping time with each other, around similar prepossessions of thought and feeling. "The steps of their progress," Buckle states ("History of English Civilisation," ii.), "are so identical that the relation between Montaigne and Descartes is just the same as that which existed between Hooker and Chillingworth, in reference to the difference in time and opinions."

And as the immediate celebrity of Hooker endowed England with Chillingworth, Montaigne's fame reawakened the life and thought of Descartes. The most salient facts in the history of both countries are to be found in their annals with a curious similarity. The French Fronde had its counterpart in the English Civil War. On both sides powerful individualities intervened to check the evil (Richelieu, Elizabeth); on both sides there arose a hitherto unknown element—the free press. The conflict became violent and passionate between the friends of progress and those of reaction, between tradition and novelty, between modern thought, which was beginning to dawn on the horizon, and the thought of the past, insensible and with its age-long power not to be easily shaken. On both sides of the Channel, behind religion, there hid the mysterious goddess of civil liberty, who from this time forward was to provoke fratricidal conflicts and soak the earth for centuries with blood.

The parallel march of events, beginning with Louis XIV. of France and Charles II. of England, is a phenomenon which must strike all impartial observers. England, it is true, preceded France, who, retarded in her movement, laboriously followed her companion of the road. But slow movement is not the same thing as immobility. Towards the end of the 18th century France suddenly made up for lost time by a superhuman effort and finally arrived at the Declaration of the Rights of Men and Citizens.

And both drew their arms from a kind of common arsenal. Descartes by his "Méthode" and the exaltation of individual thought taught England that the proof of the existence of God and of all privileges was to be found in, and never outside, oneself. Liberty of conscience was thus immovably rooted in the postulate which came from France: "I think; therefore I am." Many English workers continued to work upon this French truth, just as they did upon Montaigne's "Essais" or the "Traité de la Sagesse" of Charron, which abolished dogma, "the result of sheer chance," and inaugurated the reign of rationalism. The English appropriated French ideas in the same way as France in 1789 allowed herself to be inspired by the epic story of Cromwell. What then, does it signify that England should have made the first start?

She only worked on her own account and got there faster; France arrived later, but she worked to the profit of the whole of humanity.

III. ANGLO-FRENCH SOLIDARITY AT THE PRESENT DAY.

(a) *Great Britain is the best French Colony.*

The phenomenon of their historical solidarity amazes us with still further evidence to-day. The fraternity of the two peoples is evidenced at present almost exclusively in their commercial exchange. War and peace are often made merely in view of

an increase in the commercial balance-sheet. So-called conquering expeditions are no longer made save under the banner of creating or enlarging markets. Now it is found that merely in virtue of this instinctive fraternity of interests, which binds the two nations together, both form two reciprocal colonies. Great Britain may be given the name of the richest and most important of French colonies; and France too finds herself bound up with the fate of Great Britain, since the disappearance of English economic power would cause her incalculable harm.

To arrive at an intelligent comprehension of this "implicit union" for life and death between the two peoples, it will be enough to glance at their economic relations. The concrete and palpable facts of this fraternity of interests merely give emphasis to those abstract arguments which are drawn from their community of ideas and their struggles for the triumph of the beautiful and the ideal.

The purchases which all the French colonies taken together, including Algiers and Tunis, as well as those dispersed in the four corners of the globe, make from the capital amount to only 30 to 40 per cent. of the total sum of the purchases made by Great Britain.¹

¹ The commercial Franco-English balance-sheet shows a kind of harmony between the purchases and sales effected by the two countries. The English importation into France in 1912 reached nearly one milliard 50 thousand francs,

But, apart from this enormous total, the English expend large sums in France every year. The money left in our country by English people staying in Paris or in their favourite country haunts can readily be estimated at 500 millions of francs, to which we must add the amount spent in merchandise. We thus obtain the very large sum of about 1,800 millions which England pays yearly to France.

As one studies the special character of the products imported by England, one is tempted to believe in a kind of predestined harmony in the economic relations of the two neighbours. France chiefly sells to England the produce which she would find difficult to sell elsewhere. In this amount there may be reckoned vegetables, wine, fruit, choice early fruit, brandy, etc., of which the total sum annually reaches more than 230 millions of francs. Our agriculturists, to whom this sum is paid, would be seriously embarrassed if they were compelled to find another market for their produce.

But England profits equally. She finds in her immediate neighbour a country which completes or corrects her faults of climate and allows her to have within her reach the produce which she would

while that of France into Great Britain reached nearly 1,400 millions. In 1913 the United Kingdom's purchases from France amounted to about 1,400 millions, while France sold about 1,150 millions worth to England.

have to go without altogether or obtain at the price of great sacrifice from distant countries. And she buys from us, for a number of millions of francs, objects due to the ingenuity of the city of Paris, goods which are produced by the special abilities of French peasants (farm workers, etc.), and she also takes from us far more than half a milliard's worth of merchandise produced by the industry of our town dwellers (silk, woollen goods, produce of the large dressmakers, boots, pottery, gloves, etc.).

In spite of buying so considerably in France, England does not find her own industrial interests in the least injured thereby.

To understand the extent of this argument it is sufficient to analyse the American and, above all, the German sales on the English market. It is clear that the commercial balance-sheet of these countries is a weight upon English prosperity, that it vitally affects those branches of industry which are most living and indispensable to England's well-being—steel, machine-making, iron, etc. The success of their exportation in the majority of cases means death to similar English enterprises. In proportion as they progress, so do English industries succumb under the impetuous Germano-American attack.

And when in her turn France examines the character of the merchandise which England furnishes for her, she is brought to the same consoling reflection. On both sides there is less a rivalry

for the supremacy of the market than a tendency to unite each other's efforts in the economic sphere with the one object of common well-being.

In a word, England sells France chiefly those particular products whose profits are not only most considerable, but whose total goes almost entirely towards the enriching of her national production.

Just as in the region of politics the fact of increase in hostile forces at the frontier becomes extremely dangerous for national security, so the incessant and immeasurable increase in exportation proceeding from the same centre in the long run justifies a country's apprehensions. It is precisely from this point of view that Germany has become a permanent danger to the economic future of Great Britain.

For several years the Board of Trade returns re-echoed with pessimistic presentiments in regard to Germany. Her rivalry was there represented as a menace even to Great Britain's home market.

The lessons to be drawn from this demonstrate very clearly the stability and the beneficent necessity of Franco-English relations.

The more one studies the history of the past few years the more one sees that if this war, which was always imminent, had broken out about fifteen years later, France and England would have been brought to ruin to an almost equal degree. Germany had grown enormously, thanks to the way in which she had applied her numerous methods of monopoly,

some of which were repugnant to the Anglo-French mind. The "cartel" system, after all, can justify itself; but dumping, bonuses and bounties for exportation, commercial espionage carried to its utmost limits, consolidated tariffs, an unfair law allowing Germans to keep their nationality after having become citizens of foreign states, the marking of inventions, in short an implacable war in time of peace—these are the means which sooner or later would have given Germany the commercial and industrial domination of the world. Germany's appetite increased in a greater degree than German power and prosperity, although the latter had reached a very considerable height.

From being a poor country Germany suddenly became very rich. By 1895 the total revenue of the empire had reached more than 20 milliards of marks. By 1913 the revenue had reached about 45 milliards of marks. Savings in Germany amount to more than in France and England; they were represented by about 10 milliards of marks deposited in the banks and about 18 milliards in the savings banks.

Nothing seemed able to stop the German advance. When competition became difficult German manufacturers calmly settled in foreign countries, where, assisted by their banks, their Government, and their diplomacy, they quickly supplanted native commerce and industry. Thanks to her shipping companies, her diplomacy and consular services, thanks

to her banking organisation, thanks also to her absolute lack of those scruples which paralysed the efforts of other countries, Germany was succeeding in beating all her competitors and in dominating the world. Germany, according to Lamprecht, her accredited historian, became a veritable "tentacled state," that is, a power which by its tentacles was to bring the whole world into its grasp.

Germany was helped as much by the defects of her rivals as by her own virtues. The Germans, being a thoroughly disciplined nation, were able without much difficulty to accommodate themselves to the rule of coalition and cartel. Anglo-French individualism is foreign to it. Love of riches, tenacity, a birth-rate which was growing continually until quite recent times, a mystical faith in the greatness of Germany inculcated in the children in the elementary schools and strengthened by the teaching of the Universities and the speculations of scholars and metaphysicians, all combined to produce in Germany a strength which was concentrated and directed implacably towards one end. Discipline brings obedience, and obedience the possibility of carrying out one's plans a good way ahead, when all obstacles shall have vanished before a common ideal. In the face of this German development, so admirably organised, other nations put forward nothing but scattered efforts, without plan, without co-ordination. Europe made a great mistake in not interesting herself in these things and in not

attempting to counteract this preponderance, which bore in itself the germs of future wars. Together with the Hohenzollerns, the militarists, and the Junkers, the whole nation was seized by the giddiness of greatness. *Weltpolitik*, the *Weltstaat*, and *Weltmacht* were on all lips. The old German *bourgeoisie*, which had once been so sympathetic to the civilised world, became insatiable during these later years. All of them dreamt of becoming the world-nation and the world-power. And as other nations could not easily resign themselves to the fate of being gored by the German bull, war became a necessity.

German commercial power, far from being a guarantee of peace, formed a permanent threat to future relations between peoples. Germany's commerce and industry revolved in a vicious circle. The more they increased the more outlets they were bound to find, the more customers, the more countries to conquer, the more rivals to beat down. Peaceful expansion no longer sufficed. Colonies must be conquered, and the resistance of nations jealous of their future must be broken. Germany carried on her expansion in peace with the object of overthrowing all resistance by force of arms when the moment came. This is why every social class, every domain of German activity, made efforts to reach a maximum of power in time of peace so as to be able to use it in time of war. To use the expression of Henri Hauser, "Germany's

business policy might have been summed up in these words : ' Be my customer, or I kill you.' "

England was naturally considered the most hateful enemy of all, because she was the most powerful and the most to be feared. Russia and Italy allowed themselves to be encroached upon by Germany almost without protest. Their industry and their finance became the veritable branch establishments of Berlin. France protested against German high-handedness, but the protest was confined to the uttering of cries of indignation in the press or in pamphlets or alarmist works. Meanwhile Germany's progress continued, assuring her a certain supremacy over French industry and commerce. By a most ingenious system she succeeded in attracting French investments, and these thus assisted German industry in combating that of France.

Is anybody under the illusion that Germany will alter her conduct after this present war? All depends upon the nature of the victory and in consequence the nature of the peace which we shall impose upon her. The civilised nations who are fighting German barbarism will doubtless never reconcile themselves to reducing Germany to slavery. They will respect her national unity; they will not even be tempted to limit the future power of her armies. Desiring to re-establish right and justice, they will not wish to violate the rights of the German nation. But do not let us be

under any illusions. Although the Hohenzollerns, the militarists, and the Junkers started the war, it was latent in the collective consciousness of the German people. Even when conquered it will awaken mysteriously for its revenge, and be able later to take possession of Europe, when the latter, after the fatigue of this war, is sleeping in the quietude of peace. We have shown elsewhere that Europe will have but one means of securing itself against Germany's savagery and her instinct for domination. The people who wanted the war must pay for its consequences. And if it lasts three years the direct loss in men killed and mutilated, together with the cost of armaments and the value of property destroyed, will amount to about 600 milliards of francs. Part of this debt can be paid in kind by the Central Empires, let us say by giving up colonies and provinces or by ceding territory to the states to which it belongs. But there remains a sufficiently large amount which, if imposed as a debt on Germany, could not be settled for a hundred years. And it is the annual interest of the war indemnities which will weigh heavily upon the German Budget and prevent the Teutons from preparing for future conflict. Modern war necessitates enormous expenditure. A nation which has to support an annual payment of a certain number of milliards must be content with living and working in peace. Little by little the German people, under these conditions,

will be cured of their malady of domination and their anti-social fever. Germany will then be radically changed, and the world will gain one more nation worthy to be loved and esteemed.

But will the civilised world have the joy of seeing such a peace as this ?

In any case, the war once ended, Germany will continue to encroach upon the world. Her accumulated strength and energy will flow over the earth. England and France must form the principal security for the well-being of the world ; they should therefore come closer together, so as worthily to fulfil their part. A united brotherhood, the two peoples will draw into their wake all the other countries of the world, and in this event the construction of a Channel tunnel will obviously become a most urgent task. As Sir Lionel Earle, the English Minister of Public Works, said recently, not only had the alliance with France removed all fear of an invasion, but the tunnel would also be the cheapest and most complete guarantee against famine. Submarines and Zeppelins had significantly demonstrated the geographical isolation of England. The tunnel, once established, would form the most expressive symbol of the Anglo-French brotherhood. The two countries themselves would both be convinced of the necessity of modifying their economic system, of renouncing their excessively individualist attitude, and of bringing the

state still more into touch with their industrial and commercial interests.

Our two countries have suffered the same drawback of rule by lawyers, whose characteristic faults have been so admirably set forth by Mr. Sidney Low. It is essential for us henceforward to have recourse more to men of action than to men of words. We must know how to organise industry and commerce, and particularly exportation. We must enlist the unequal efforts of private enterprise and unite them harmoniously, making them capable of producing a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. This is not a science to be improvised. Neither France nor England can renounce the historic virtues of their race, their spirit of initiative and independence. Neither can ever be transformed into an automaton like Germany. But it is essential that they should remind themselves of certain necessities of the present which make the abandonment of ancient error essential. Without adopting the reprehensible means employed by Germany, they will have the duty of appropriating to themselves that real and efficacious method which is in accordance with the morality of civilised peoples, and which permits them to counteract all attempts directed against the security of their future existence.

France begins to be penetrated by it in the same degree as England. A disturbing phenomenon—Franco-British solidarity is demonstrated by the

necessity both countries are under of having recourse to the same virtues and of combating the same faults. This fruitful collaboration, proclaimed on both sides of the Channel, is a guarantee at the same time of the future—financial, economic, and political—of the two peoples.

How is it to be explained then that even in view of this solidarity of interests, proceeding from a common origin, from culture, from services rendered and yet to be rendered, a sort of mistrust has nevertheless continually envenomed the relations between the two countries? The reason is that international alliances rarely correspond to the needs and natural inclinations of the nations thus bound to each other. Diplomacy often puts out of action the machinery of public life. The people, deceived by all sorts of fishers in troubled waters, like individuals taken aside, often run counter to their own interests. Like blind men cast out on the high-road, the people grope their way in their march towards the future and fall into the hands of those ill-wishers who distract them from a goal quite easy of attainment. Meanwhile the great and exhaustive achievements of Anglo-French sympathy throughout history do not in the least prevent its having a new lease of life. Like the soldier who, fatigued and sleepy after a long battle, yet, with eyes almost closed, continues to advance, so it proceeds with sure foot towards the great goal lost in the shadows.

This mutual attraction which binds the two peoples has resisted diplomatic intrigues as well as the fury of war. "After thirty years of struggle," the English sociologist Charles Pearson says, "the feeling between the soldiers of Wellington and Soult became one of cordial respect."

It should not be forgotten that in France there always existed an "English" party, tending towards a more intimate *rapprochement* between the two nations. Without wishing to stray into the past, let us remember that the best and most clear-sighted statesmen of the Third Republic, beginning with Thiers and Gambetta, have never ceased to see in a Franco-English union the safety of the two peoples as well as the security of peace and liberty.

It is the same on the other side of the water, where all the men who embodied the English mind and true English patriotism have never concealed their tender regard for France.

Gibbon, who visited Paris during the Seven Years' War, stated "that there a ray of national glory illuminated everything English" because it was always presumed that every Englishman was born a patriot and a philosopher. In the *Journal Encyclopédique* of the time (1760 and 1765) there are to be found innumerable proofs that, even during the war against England and after the conclusion of the peace which deprived France of her finest colonies, the French people still retained the most amicable

sentiments towards England. One month after the conclusion of peace Favart had a play acted in Paris in which he exalted the Anglo-French union amid the plaudits of the crowd.

“ Courage and honour draw together the countries
And two peoples, equal in virtues, in light.”

(b) *United in War.*

The present brotherhood in arms has put to flight the last clouds of ill-will and the jealousies of other days. From the moment the war began it was surprising to see on both sides of the Channel the same nobility of feeling, the same pride of aspiration, the same respect for right and justice. “ The same humanity ” is evident in the discussions of statesmen, in the language of the press, and in the contact of sentiments. The speeches of an Asquith or of a Lloyd George could be signed “ Poincaré ” or “ Viviani ” without arousing or disturbing a single Englishman.

The two peoples are intoxicated with the same joy at the words spoken by men of repute who embody their common hopes and heroism. In this fraternal collaboration, which gets closer every day, reciprocal affection and admiration do not cease to grow. An English writer, Mr. A. Clutton Brock, gives an eloquent explanation of the fact: “ We admire France as we have never admired a nation before. She has a kind of strength new to nations, and further she remains the

chief treasury of all that which the Germans, those conscious barbarians, wish to destroy."

And all that this distinguished mind accords to France is attributed by her to England. The two countries give equal admiration to one another's courage, chivalrous spirit, humanitarian conception of the necessities and the duties of war. We have enumerated several heroic acts of the French. But how can one fail to marvel at those accomplished by the English? The official reports which describe them must be followed by anyone who desires to understand of what this people is capable—this people which before the war ignored compulsory military service and appeared to leave the warlike virtues in the hands of an army of mercenaries. The English volunteers have extorted admiration even from the Germans. Their courage, their presence of mind, their endurance, and their contempt for danger and death made heroes of them in the most noble sense of the word. On returning to their country they will undoubtedly exalt the virtues of their French comrades, but they should be convinced that for many years, if not many centuries, France will remember the courage and charm which they have left behind them, and from these will draw many reasons for her love for the "braves du Royaume-Uni."

In the battles of Mons and Le Cateau the English resisted a German army four times more numerous and inflicted heavy losses upon it. In the battles

of the Marne and the Aisne it was said that their impetuosity had no equal, and that their energy was proof against all fatigue. In the battles of the Yser they were simply incomparable. But the deeds of English heroism, chivalrous and individual, have a strange similarity to those accomplished by the French. It is one more proof that the human ideal which warms and guides our hearts finds expression in similar deeds and acts.

Take, for example, the exploit of a Highlander worthy to rank among the most wonderful deeds of antiquity. Forty English soldiers were put to hold a bridge. Suddenly thousands of Germans scattered behind a wood hurled themselves upon the English, who succumbed to superior numbers. All were killed except one man. He placed on his shoulder the only Maxim gun which the little band possessed, carried it to the end of the bridge, and faced the German attack. He fired and fired continually up till the moment when a rain of shots succeeded in striking him down. But his heroic act was not in vain. The Germans were held back, and English forces arrived in time to put them to the rightabout.

English courage is increased twofold by the addition of a magnanimous heart. The Germans are undoubtedly just as courageous, but their courage is of another order. They are in any case unable to raise themselves, as it were, to that

height of altruism which distinguishes Franco-English heroism.

Before Ypres the Germans, who had been repulsed in a violent attack against the English trenches were carrying off their wounded. One wounded German, however, was left on the field. An English officer came out from his shelter and went out to his assistance. Thereupon a rain of bullets from the enemy trenches struck the Englishman. Badly wounded, he stumbled, recovered himself, and continued his way. The Germans understood and ceased firing. The English officer walked on in spite of his loss of blood, in spite of the pain of his wounds. He went towards his wounded enemy, lifted him, and carried him towards the German trenches. This almost superhuman act brought cries of admiration from the Germans themselves. One of their superior officers, seized by a lively emotion, pinned the Iron Cross on his breast. The Englishman saluted and returned to his lines. His strength failed him ; he fainted, and fell to the earth dead.

What other acts of a similar heroism might be described ! The exploit of " L " battery near Compiègne is a typical case. The Royal Artillery Regiment was bivouacking near a village. A heavy mist covered the plain. Suddenly the mist cleared, and a gunner perceived in the proximity of the German trenches on their right and at about 700 metres distance six enemy guns posted in front

of them. The enemy opened a murderous fire. The gunners attempted to fire their pieces, but three of the latter were instantaneously put out of action. Of the three that remained two were destroyed in a short time. There remained only one, which was served by a sergeant-major, a gunner, and a driver. These men continued to fire until they had destroyed or put out of action all the German guns.

It may be said of the English what Ernest Lavisse said of the French soldiers. Their heroism is made more beautiful by the addition of a smiling grace such as the French possess, and their volunteers are already the equals of splendid veterans.

Posterity will rejoice to give emphasis to an incident of this war which redounds to the honour of both countries.

The requisite sober and dry character of the French *communiqués*, which formed such a happy contrast to German and Austrian boastings and lies, ended by confusing a section of public opinion in the United Kingdom.

The English General Staff gave the first alarm-signal, in which it was followed by the whole of the British press. With enthusiastic chivalry and an incomparable sense of justice, it lifted the veil which till then had hidden French merits. Lord Kitchener's speech in the House of Lords was followed by innumerable articles and essays in which the French army and French generals were given

their due. The *Observer* well sums up the English state of mind in the words "The French have done nine-tenths of the work ; the power of France will make the defeat of Germany certain."

(c) *Anglo-French Union.*

It is impossible to establish the "United States of Europe" at once. Let us then be content to promote the partial union of its most influential members. Seen from this standpoint, the Anglo-French union, which, by the force of circumstances, must enlarge itself to include the heroic Belgian people and the immense empire of the Czars, as well as Italy and all neutral countries, proclaims itself from this time forth as the initiator of peace and of the healthy progress of the world.

The two nations have everything to gain and nothing to lose by submitting themselves to the common influences which have shaped their respective souls. By making more firm the kindly chains which bind them they will form a unity of interests and forces which will allow them to rescue old Europe from the dangers which threaten her and to guarantee to humanity a future of peaceful evolution. We on both sides of the Channel must work in this sense and bring back to the consciousness of both peoples the indestructible ties and the mutual services which have bound them together throughout their history.

This union, in the name of humanity and for the

defence of its future, would become a guarantee for the whole world without threat to anyone. By it Europe would be finally delivered from the horrible nightmare of future wars, from a possible return of the learned barbarism of the Germans, and in consequence from an armed peace which ruins and dishonours her.

The idea of the United States of Europe still makes the wise smile; but starting from the *rapprochement* between, and the union of, the Allies, its normal point of departure, it will grow under this efficacious tutelage until it attains the rank of a postulate in the international life of the morrow.

It is clear that before we can bring back all the nations of Europe and place them under the protecting shield of union *we must begin by taking partial groups*. Now, what could be more durable for the building of the peace of to-morrow than the foundation which will have been laid by a *rapprochement* cemented in this terrible war? The normal and beneficent evolution of Europe and that of the whole of humanity will there find its due, and so will the happiness and prosperity of France and of the United Kingdom. They will march hand in hand, and, joined by Italy and Russia, they will bring the world to peace and rescue from peril the sacred principles of civilisation and of international morality.

